



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,097	01/24/2005	Elmar Kibler	3165-115	9494
6449	7590	07/18/2008		
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
			EXAMINER BROWN, COURTNEY A	
			ART UNIT 1616	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/18/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/522,097	KIBLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	COURTNEY BROWN	1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,10,11,13 and 17-35 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,10,11,13 and 17-35 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/24/2005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of Amendments/Remarks filed on April 7, 2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 17, 19-29, 31, 33, and 34 have been amended. Claims 2-9, 12, 14-16 stand cancelled. Claims 1,10,11,13, and 17- 35 are being examined for patentability.

Priority

Priority to PCT /EP03/08114 filed on July 24, 2002 is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on January 24, 2005 has been considered by the examiner.

Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from the previous Office Action are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections and/or objections presently being applied to the instant application.

Double Patenting

Applicant's request to hold in abeyance the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-35 over claims 1-32 of Application 10/522,157 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1,10,11,13, and 17- 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sievernich et al. (CA 2,334,955).

Applicant's Invention

Applicant claims a herbicidal mixture comprising three or four active ingredients including component A, **4-[2-methyl-3-(4,5-dihydroisoxazol-3-yl)-4-methylsulfonyl-benzoyl]-1-methyl-5-hydroxy-1H-pyrazole**; component B, at least one compound selected from **flumetsulam** or **clopyralid**, (wherein component A and component B are present in a weight ration of 1:0.002 to 1:800); and component C, at least one herbicidal compound selected from the group consisting of at least one of acetyl-CoA carboxylase inhibitors, acetolactate synthase inhibitors, amides, auxin herbicides, auxin transport inhibitors, carotenoid biosynthesis inhibitors, enolpyruvylshikimate 3-phosphate synthase inhibitors, glutamine synthase inhibitors, lipid biosynthesis inhibitors, mitosis inhibitors, protoporphyrinogen IX oxidase inhibitors, photosynthesis

inhibitors, synergists, growth substances, cell wall biosynthesis inhibitors (specifically **diflufenzopyr, acetochlor, or atrazine**) or a variety of other herbicides in a synergistically effective amount. Applicant also claims the herbicidal mixture as defined above wherein there is at least one inert liquid and/or solid carrier, and if desired, at least one surfactant. Additionally, applicant claims a process for preparation of the herbicidal composition and a method of controlling undesired vegetation comprising applying simultaneously or separately to the leaves of said vegetation, the environment of said vegetation and/or seed of said vegetation.

***Determination of the scope and the content of the prior art
(MPEP 2141.01)***

Sievernich et al. teach a synergistic herbicidal mixture comprising at least one 3-heteroxyxyl-substituted benzoyl derivative, or its environmentally compatible salts. Sievernich **teach 4-[2-methyl-3-(4,5-dihydroisoxazol-3-yl)-4-methylsulfonyl-benzoyl]-1-methyl-5-hydroxy-1H-pyrazole** as a most particularly preferred 3-heteroxyxyl-substituted benzoyl derivative (page 20, lines 19-21, claims 1, 19, 21, and 34, component A of instant application).

Sievernich et al. teach that the said synergistic herbicidal mixture also comprises a synergistically effective amount of at least one herbicidal compound from the group consisting of acetyl-CoA carboxylase inhibitors, acetolactate synthase inhibitors,

amides, auxin herbicides, auxin transport inhibitors, carotenoid biosynthesis inhibitors, enolpyruvylshikimate 3-phosphate synthase inhibitors, glutamine synthase inhibitors, lipid biosynthesis inhibitors, mitosis inhibitors, protoporphyrinogen IX oxidase inhibitors, photosynthesis inhibitors, synergists, growth substances, cell wall biosynthesis inhibitors or a variety of other herbicides (page 1, lines 4-40 , page 1a, lines 1-6, page 2, lines 1-6 and claims 1 of reference, claims 1,17,18,21,24,25,27,28, and 34, component C of instant application) Specifically, Sievernich et al. teach the use of **flumetsulam** (page 21, line 1, claims 1, 10,11, and 13, component B of instant application), **clopyralid** (page 21, line14, claims 1,19,20,23 and 24, component B and C of instant application), **diflufenzopyr** (page 23,line12, claim 20 and 29, component C of instant application), **acetochlor** (page 83, line 15, claim 23, component C of instant application) and **atrazine** (page 84, line 29, claims 26 and 29, component C of instant application).

Sievernich et al. teach, in a further particular embodiment, a synergistic herbicidal mixture comprising as component A, a 3-heteroxyxyl-substituted benzoyl derivative and as component B, **two herbicidal compounds** (page 34, lines 42-46, claims 1 and 10 , at least three active ingredients of instant application).

Sievernich et al. teach that as a rule, the mixture comprise components A and B in such weight ratios that the synergistic effect takes place(ratios of components A and C of the instant application) in the mixture preferably range from 1:0.002 to 1:800 (page 38, lines 20-24, claim 31 of instant application). Sievernich et al. teach, in particular, teach that the mixture comprises components A and B2 (acetolactate synthase inhibitors) 5-hydroxy-1H-pyrazole,flumestulam or clopyralid ,and a third herbicidal

Art Unit: 1616

compound are not disclosed or suggested in Sievernich et al.. This is not persuasive because Sivernich et al. does teach, in a further particular embodiment in a weight ratio (ratios of components A and B of the instant application) in the mixture range from 1:0.004 to 1:106 (page 39, lines 13-40, claim 30 of instant application).

Sievernich et al. further teach that the herbicidal compositions have an herbicidally active amount of a synergistic herbicidal mixture and at least one liquid and/or solid carrier and if desired, at least one surfactant (page 2, lines 8-11, claims 32 and 33, solid and/or liquid carrier and surfactant, instant invention).

Sievernich et al. also teach that their invention relates to processes for preparation of said synergistic herbicidal mixtures and to a method of controlling undesirable vegetation (page 2, lines 13-15, claims 33 and 34, process of preparation and method of controlling undesired vegetation of instant application). Sievernich et al. teach that the active ingredients of components A) and B) can be formulated jointly, but also separately, and/or applied to the plants, their environment and/or seeds jointly or separately (page 37, lines 31-33, claim 34, applied to vegetation and/or seeds of instant application). Sievernich et al. teach that it is preferable to apply the active ingredients simultaneously, but it is possible to apply them separately (page 37, lines 33-35, claim 34, applied simultaneously or in separately of the instant application). Sievernich et al. further teach the mixtures can be applied pre-or post- emergence and that in the case of post-emergence treatment of the plants (page 38, lines 1-2), the herbicidal compositions according to the invention are preferably applied by foliar application (page 38, lines 11-13, claim 35 ,application to leaves, of instant application).

***Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims
(MPEP 2141.02)***

The difference between the invention of the instant application and that of Sievernich et al. is that the instant invention requires a specific synergistic herbicidal mixture comprising at least 4 components or active ingredients (claim 11) .

Finding of prima facie obviousness

Rationale and Motivation (MPEP 2142-2143)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Sievernich et al. to arrive at a synergistic herbicidal mixture comprising at least four components. Although Sievernich et al. do not teach a synergistic herbicidal mixture with a fourth active ingredient, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to devise a synergistic herbicidal mixture comprising 4-[2-methyl-3-(4,5-dihydroisoxazol-3-yl-4-methylsulfonyl-benzoyl]-1-methyl-5-hydroxy-1H-pyrazole, flumestulam, and clopyralid as taught by Sievernich et al. and to add an

additional component C. One would be motivated to make this combination with the expected benefit of having a taught synergistic herbicidal mixture with enhanced effectiveness, depending on the third component being used. A composition that consists of the same components will possess the same properties and therefore lead to identical, desired results. Additionally, the Examiner notes that there are no examples given in the specification showing a quaternary herbicidal combination. Therefore, the Examiner cannot conclusively determine if the claimed herbicidal combination of 4-[2-methyl-3-(4,5-dihydroisoxazol-3-yl-4-methylsulfonyl-benzoyl]-1-methyl-5-hydroxy-1H-pyrazole, flumetsulam, clopyralid , and a fourth component produces a synergistic herbicidal mixture.

Examiner's Response to Applicant's Remarks

Applicant's arguments filed on April 7, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that ternary synergistic herbicidal mixtures, comprising 4-[2-methyl-3-(4,5-dihydroisoxazol-3-yl-4-methylsulfonyl-benzoyl]-1-methyl-5-hydroxy-1H-pyrazole, and flumetsulam or clopyralid and a third herbicidal compound are not disclosed or suggested in Sievernich et al. However, Sievernich et al. do teach a synergistic herbicidal mixture comprising as component A, a 3-heteroxyxyl-substituted benzoyl derivative and as component B, **two herbicidal compounds** (page 34, lines 42-46).

Applicant argues that Sievernich et al. do not demonstrate or provide examples of synergistic activity of compounds of formula I (i.e., a 3-heteroxyxyl-substituted benzoyl derivative) with flumetsulam or clopyralid. Additionally, Applicant points out that Sievernich et al. do teach synergistic ternary mixtures of compound of formula I with other active compounds and that one of skill in the art would not be motivated to use mixtures other than those exemplified as synergistic mixtures. This is not persuasive because obviousness is established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art as a whole to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the reference. Sivernich et al. does teach, in a further particular embodiment, a synergistic herbicidal mixture comprising as component A, a 3-heteroxyxyl-substituted benzoyl derivative and as component B, **two herbicidal compounds** (page 34, lines 42-46).

Additionally, Applicant argues that Sievernich et al. provides no indication as to how one might select the inventive components B (flumetsulam or clopyralid) from a wide range of potential mixing partners and to choose an additional component C. This is not persuasive because Sievernich et al. do specifically claim a synergistic mixture with components clopyralid and flumetsulam selected from a group of about 28 different herbicidal compounds (see page 88, claim 14 of reference). Thus, this specific claimed group is very narrow in range and it would therefore be easy and common for one of ordinary skill to arrive at a synergistic mixture comprising clopyralid and flumetsulam.

Therefore, the claimed herbicidal combination is not surprising and non-obvious in view of Sievernich et al.

Conclusion

None of the claims are allowed.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR Only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electron Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Courtney Brown, whose telephone number is 571-270-3284. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Courtney A. Brown
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600
Group Art Unit 1616

/Johann R. Richter/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616